1	
2	
3	
4	
5	
6	
7	
8	UPPER MISSISSIPPI RIVER - ILLINOIS WATERWAY
9	SYSTEM NAVIGATION STUDY PUBLIC WORKSHOP
10	
11	
12	
13	taken at the Des Moines Botanical Center, 909 East
14	River Drive, Des Moines, Iowa, commencing at
15	8:15 p.m., Tuesday, August 3, 1999.
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	DARCY K. METTLER - CERTIFIED SHORTHAND REPORTER
	SUSAN FRYE AND ASSOCIATES, INC.

- 1 PROCEEDINGS
- 2 MR. WIEDMAN: Okay. Let's get settled
- 3 back into your chairs. Okay. Let me take a
- 4 minute to describe the last two parts of the
- 5 evening, and let me also say thank you for being
- 6 willing to go into the groups. I know it's much
- 7 more productive. Everyone gets a chance to have
- 8 their say instead of one person on the mike and
- 9 the other 45 people sit. So thank you. There's a
- 10 lot of information that's coming out of the
- 11 groups.
- 12 In Part 3, the question-and-answer
- 13 session, we have a format that seems to have
- 14 worked pretty well. We try to take some
- 15 representative questions from each of the groups.
- 16 You'll see a facilitator's handing Gary some
- 17 cards.
- 18 What we'll do is take three or four
- 19 questions from each group. He'll look at the
- 20 questions and make sure that those disciplines,
- 21 where it's appropriate, get the cards, and they
- 22 have a chance to kind of formulate their answer.
- 23 After we run through those, we'll open it
- 24 up to questions from the floor, and unfortunately,
- 25 tonight we only have two mikes; one up here, and

1 one in the middle. Because Darcy is now recording

- 2 our question-and-answer session and also
- 3 statements, you'll need to come to the mikes to
- 4 make sure there's not an amplitude problem.
- 5 When we finish the question-and-answer,
- 6 we'll move into the more formal. Those of you
- 7 that want to make statements and you've come with
- 8 prepared remarks, if you have, and you want to
- 9 summarize them, I'll take a quick check to see how
- 10 many want to make statements when that fourth part
- 11 moves up, and then we'll see how much time each
- 12 person has.
- But if you've brought prepared
- 14 statements, please make sure the Corps gets a copy
- 15 of it, because that's helpful, along with the
- 16 other information we've gathered.
- 17 And, Gary, are you ready to go? Okay.
- 18 MR. LOSS: What we've been doing at the
- 19 previous meetings is trying to answer several of
- 20 the questions that come up in the groups. That's
- 21 why you're using the cards, to try and get those
- 22 divided up into the different disciplines. So
- 23 we're going to do that again tonight in trying to
- 24 answer as much as we can, but then you'll also
- 25 have an opportunity to ask us those questions that

- 1 we don't answer completely here.
- 2 There's two questions here related --
- 3 sort of general -- what mechanism does the Corps
- 4 have in place to compare the economic importance
- 5 of the Upper Mississippi River infrastructure
- 6 investments with investments in other river
- 7 systems? The Ohio River System has captured a
- 8 lion's share of the inland waterways trust fund
- 9 for the past 20 years.
- 10 The second question: Why does the Ohio
- 11 system get all of new investment dollars?
- 12 Probably the politically correct answer
- 13 to that question is that that's why we go through
- 14 the economic analysis that we go through. You saw
- 15 me show before the average annual net benefits.
- 16 It's a very carefully prescribed system
- 17 that's laid out for the Corps of Engineers to use
- 18 so we can compare one study to another. As it
- 19 goes to Washington, they can sort through this and
- 20 determine where the most net benefits are for the
- 21 country.
- 22 The other part of it is politics, and the
- 23 Ohio River has had a strong, lush, political
- 24 contingent that has been able to capitalize on
- 25 getting monies brought back to the Ohio River, and

- 1 it's just the reality of what's going on.
- 2 It depends on who we elect as Congressmen
- 3 from the Midwest and what kind of connections they
- 4 have there. So it's a reality.
- 5 In our study here we're trying to come up
- 6 with the best analysis we have, what the costs and
- 7 benefits are related to the studies, give that
- 8 information to Congress, and let Congress then
- 9 decide what they want to do with that.
- 10 And that's the system we live in in this
- 11 United States. It has a lot of disadvantages, but
- 12 there's a lot of good points for them too.
- 13 So the Ohio River has had a lot of
- 14 needs. They have a lot of traffic there; a lot of
- 15 shippers that don't have much choice as far as how
- 16 the traffic moves there. So they've done a lot of
- 17 improvements.
- 18 Their system in many cases is an older
- 19 system than the Upper Miss also. So hopefully
- 20 that answers that.
- 21 Barge industry pays its way, or
- 22 subsidized and paid by taxpayers? The lock and
- 23 dam operation is paid for from general revenues,
- 24 from our tax dollars. The improvements that we're
- 25 talking about here tonight would be paid 50/50

1 from the trust fund that I just talked about,

- 2 which is a tax on the fuel that the barge
- 3 companies pay.
- 4 Fifty percent of the cost of improvements
- 5 would come from the trust fund. The other 50
- 6 percent would come from general revenues. So, you
- 7 know, the taxpayers are paying for half. Barge
- 8 companies are paying for the other half.
- 9 Then sort of a philosophical question
- 10 here: Is the Corps of Engineers promoting
- 11 employing itself by lock and dam systems? And I
- 12 think the best answer there is: The Corps of
- 13 Engineers does what Congress tells us to do.
- 14 In this case Congress has asked us to
- 15 take a look at what the needs are for the next 50
- 16 years in the navigation system. We're trying to
- 17 be as objective as we can looking at the pros and
- 18 cons, laying that back out for Congress.
- 19 Congress has also asked us to be
- 20 regulators, issuing permits for boat ramps or to
- 21 fill in wetlands and all that. We have large
- 22 recreation areas. We have large flood control
- 23 projects. Again, all things that Congress has
- 24 asked the Corps of Engineers to do.
- 25 Can the Corps survive without lock and

1 dam systems? Probably. It depends what Congress

- 2 decrees. A lot of agencies have come and gone
- 3 because Congress has said, "We don't need or want
- 4 them anymore." The Administration has created new
- 5 agencies.
- 6 I don't think we're dependent on lock and
- 7 dam systems to exist. Hopefully we're more
- 8 objective than that in proposing what this country
- 9 needs.
- 10 Who wants to go next? Dave, do you have
- 11 a question there?
- 12 CORPS PERSONNEL: Sure. Actually, I'm
- 13 kind of splitting this one with Ken Barr from the
- 14 environmental group, and I'll pass it off to him
- 15 for the latter part of it.
- 16 Why do two or three barges show up at a
- 17 lock all at once? It's part of the way the tows
- 18 are processed on the system. I guess I take that
- 19 as some of the scheduling too on the lock system.
- 20 Gary mentioned in his presentation that
- 21 as part of the study, we looked at over 100
- 22 improvement measurements as potential options to
- 23 reduce delays to commercial navigation traffic.
- 24 Ninety-two of those were what we called low-scale
- 25 missions, less costly ones, and scheduling options

- 1 was one of them we took a look at.
- 2 Through our team discussion we realized
- 3 we have a lot of variability out in there in
- 4 moving tows. To have some type of automated
- 5 system, like air traffic control, we didn't feel
- 6 was doable; however, under the existing operation
- 7 of the locks system, there's what we term end-up/
- 8 end-down.
- 9 It's already implemented as part of the
- 10 system and will continue, and that's where you
- 11 have several tow boats moving downstream in the
- 12 same direction, and all those are pulled through
- 13 the system together; not through back-to-back,
- 14 because it's more efficient timewise to lock
- 15 several tows going the same direction instead of
- 16 doing what's called an exchange where you'd lock
- 17 one. And maybe there's one downstream, and then
- 18 you'd exchange it out and lock one through maybe
- 19 upstream. That's less efficient.
- 20 So you will see three, four, five tow
- 21 boats locked through going one direction before it
- 22 switches out and allows it to lock with another
- 23 direction. It saves time.
- 24 And the latter part of that question was:
- 25 Does this cause more delays in a negative

- 1 environmental impact regarding resuspension of
- 2 sediments and turbidity? So I'll let Ken talk
- 3 about that for a few moments on that issue.
- 4 CORPS PERSONNEL: In fact, as part of
- 5 site-specific look at each of the lock and dam
- 6 sites, we did identify where the primary and
- 7 secondary waiting areas are, and if those are up
- 8 against a bank or over a mussel bed, that's
- 9 something that we're really concerned about.
- 10 Those are the ideal candidates for having mooring
- 11 facilities away from the bankline. So as part of
- 12 our improvements we would recommend -- To avoid,
- 13 minimize some of those waiting area impacts, we
- 14 would put mooring cells or develop other areas for
- 15 waiting.
- 16 And I guess it's fairly intuitive if we
- 17 can lock through quicker, then, at least initially
- 18 until we've readjusted. Again, there won't be
- 19 quite as much sitting there and churning as it
- 20 will only take us 55 minutes instead of 100
- 21 minutes to lock through. So we would get some
- 22 initial environmental good, I guess, out of having
- 23 the extended locks there.
- 24 Maybe I'll just go on with my questions,
- 25 Gary. I had a couple of questions.

1 When will a cumulative environmental

- 2 analysis be done? Early on in this study, as we
- 3 went out in 1992-93 to the public, we were talking
- 4 about navigation expansion and the effects of
- 5 traffic on the system. But everybody came up and
- 6 said, "Yeah, but what has the first 60 years of
- 7 taking a free-flowing river, putting in a series
- 8 of dams, and creating this lakelike environment
- 9 done to the environment?"
- 10 When we first put in the locks and dams,
- 11 basically the dams, it created extensive
- 12 backwaters, some new side channels that weren't
- 13 there before. But folks were very, very
- 14 concerned, especially with sedimentation. And
- 15 even though there was an initial boom for
- 16 wildlife, waterfowl, fishes, and the likes, there
- 17 seems to have been -- There appeared to be a
- 18 decline in the fifties and sixties.
- 19 So what we did -- I think it was in March
- 20 of 1995, then Coronel Cox -- is we basically stole
- 21 a million and a half dollars from the engineering
- 22 component of this study and said, "Use existing
- 23 information and do a cumulative impact analysis
- 24 that looks at what's happened to the first 50
- 25 years of having the dam system, and then also

1 project what will happen in the next 50 years."

- 2 So what we did is hired experts, like
- 3 Gary said, in geomorphology, hydrology, and
- 4 ecology. Dr. Knox is a geomorphologist from
- 5 Madison. Dr. Nikoto is with the Institute for
- 6 Hydraulic Research at the University of Iowa. We
- 7 had a private contractor, West Consultants, that
- 8 are experts in sediment transport, and then
- 9 Dr. Steve Bartell from Oakridge was our
- 10 ecologist.
- 11 Anyway, they spent about two years
- 12 together. They got a whole series of aerial
- 13 photos and everything that was in the vault.
- 14 Basically we had aerial photos from the forties,
- 15 from the seventies, and from 1989.
- 16 They looked at each of those. They
- 17 identified areas where we were getting island
- 18 loss. They identified areas where we were getting
- 19 backwater sedimentation and siltation. They
- 20 identified how much side channels we had in the
- 21 forties versus the nineties.
- 22 And then, based on their expert opinion
- 23 and knowledge of geomorphic processes, they said,
- 24 "Which of these processes will continue in the
- 25 next 50 years, and where, in each of those pools,

- 1 can we anticipate continued backwater loss,
- 2 continued erosion of islands, and so on and so
- 3 forth?"
- 4 We feel that's a really important
- 5 backdrop, because the idea here is: If bluegills
- 6 are being ran over by tow boats today, and you
- 7 have X amount of bluegill habitat, maybe that's no
- 8 big deal. But if you're losing certain classes of
- 9 backwaters and side channels that are really
- 10 important to some fish, then maybe that same
- 11 impact 20 or 30 years from now will be a bigger
- 12 deal.
- 13 So the report itself has been completed
- 14 and drafted. It went out to the EPA, Fish and
- 15 Wildlife Service, and the DNR about two weeks ago,
- 16 and they usually turn around their comments on
- 17 that in about 45 days. The Corps will take those
- 18 back and work with our contractors and consultants
- 19 and then finalize that report, and then it will be
- 20 available to the general public.
- 21 The second question is: Does habitat
- 22 replacement really work? That's really good. You
- 23 can't really replace what nature has done out
- 24 there and what's taken thousands of years to
- 25 create.

1 In the mitigation process, once we

- 2 identify an adverse impact on the environment, the
- 3 mitigation process is first: Look at all those
- 4 ways to avoid those impacts. If you go through
- 5 all the avoidance strategies, your second step is:
- 6 "Okay. If you can't fully avoid the impact, then
- 7 look at how we might minimize the impact."
- 8 An example of this is if we have a really
- 9 important plant bed that increased traffic is
- 10 going to affect, perhaps we can avoid that by
- 11 moving the sailing line over and then avoid
- 12 impacts to that plant bed.
- 13 The second step is to minimize those
- 14 impacts, if you can. So if you can't move the
- 15 channel over because it's a fairly narrow piece of
- 16 river, then perhaps we can put up some kind of a
- 17 buffer; like create some kind of an abutment that
- 18 will keep sediment from being resuspended and
- 19 going back and affecting that plant bed; minimize
- 20 those impacts.
- 21 Then the last choice is this replacement
- 22 choice. If we can't avoid minimizing impacts,
- 23 then we'll look at ways we might be able to
- 24 enhance submerged aquatic vegetation in
- 25 off-channel areas or attempt to replace that.

1 Again, that's usually a third choice; not

- 2 a first choice. And often there's a requirement
- 3 not to replace one for one but replace one and a
- 4 half or two for one because of the acknowledgment
- 5 that when you create something, it's either going
- 6 to take a while to establish itself, or it may not
- 7 be nearly as successful as what nature gave us to
- 8 begin with. So those are considered in our
- 9 mitigation process.
- 10 That's all the questions I have.
- 11 MR. LOSS: Thank you, Ken. Economics has
- 12 got a number of questions there. I hope we've
- 13 grouped them a little bit so Rich can address them
- 14 generally.
- 15 CORPS PERSONNEL: I have a couple of
- 16 questions here that really follow the same theme.
- 17 The first is: Are there cost-benefit estimates
- 18 for a privatization option where the barge
- 19 industry leases, maintains, and operates the
- 20 system of locks? And similar to that, another
- 21 question: What is the cost-benefit analysis on
- 22 all public expenditures on navigation such as
- 23 maintaining the channels, maintenance, and
- 24 renovation of the dams and improvements in the
- 25 locks?

- 1 The Corps is currently spending
- 2 approximately \$115 million to operate and maintain
- 3 the Upper Mississippi Illinois Waterway System.
- 4 We estimate that there are benefits in excess of
- 5 \$650 million a year that are generated as a result
- 6 of that system being in place. These essentially
- 7 are transportation savings that result as -- or
- 8 are due to the lock and dam system. So I think
- 9 that addresses the notion of a cost-benefit
- 10 analysis on the expenditures.
- Now, in addition to the operation and
- 12 maintenance, there's the suggestion here about
- 13 renovation. I think that's equivalent to what we
- 14 would refer to as major rehabilitation;
- 15 expenditures over and above what you would
- 16 normally consider to be operation and maintenance
- 17 expenditures.
- 18 Whenever the Corps pursues a major rehab
- 19 job, there's always an incremental economic
- 20 analysis that's performed to ensure that the
- 21 benefits that are produced from that piece of work
- 22 exceeded the cost. So we are doing a benefit-cost
- 23 ratio on those.
- 24 Another question here is: What is the
- 25 cost of not improving the system; the cost to the

1 human environment, the environmental added costs

- 2 to farmers and taxpayers? Essentially, the cost
- 3 of not improving the system are the benefits
- 4 foregone; the benefits that you don't capture as a
- 5 result of making the improvements, specifically
- 6 the benefits that were identified in the
- 7 presentation earlier tonight. Those
- 8 transportation savings would not be realized
- 9 without the improvements, and those benefits that
- 10 you don't capture really are the costs of not
- 11 making the improvements. That's the economic
- 12 component to this.
- Now, additionally, the question addresses
- 14 environmental. We're still working on a part of
- 15 the overall analysis, and that piece that's still
- 16 to be completed will address fuel emissions and
- 17 accidents and spills as a result of traffic that
- 18 the waterway will not be able to accommodate as a
- 19 result of future congestion and how those areas --
- 20 Fuel, accidents, and spills -- I guess that the
- 21 major areas -- what will those areas look like if
- 22 we have to put additional traffic onto the
- 23 highways or onto rails? So we are addressing
- 24 those areas in some additional studies that aren't
- 25 complete as of now.

1 The last question I have here is: Why

- 2 not put more money into increasing the capacity of
- 3 the rail system? Answer here is, I think, that
- 4 the waterway system essentially is a public
- 5 resource. We all own it.
- 6 The rail system, obviously, is
- 7 different. That's a private enterprise. The
- 8 Corps has no authority to delve directly into
- 9 private resources such as the railroad system.
- 10 The Corps' specific authority, as directed by
- 11 Congress, is to maintain, operate, and to evaluate
- 12 improvements to the waterway system.
- 13 UNIDENTIFIED WORKSHOP PARTICIPANT: So
- 14 who should that question be directed to, then?
- 15 CORPS PERSONNEL: The questions of
- 16 putting more expenditures into the rail system?
- 17 UNIDENTIFIED WORKSHOP PARTICIPANT: Yes.
- 18 CORPS PERSONNEL: I quess ultimately
- 19 that's a question that needs to be directed the
- 20 way of our elected representatives.
- 21 UNIDENTIFIED WORKSHOP PARTICIPANT: Did
- 22 that go on the record, then? Is that there in the
- 23 record?
- 24 MR. LOSS: Just ask it. The court
- 25 reporter is getting it, yes.

1 I guess one thing that comes to mind, as

- 2 Richard's answering that, is that I've worked for
- 3 the Corps for over 25 years and back in the
- 4 seventies doing flood control projects, and we
- 5 still do it. When there's railroad relocations
- 6 involved, the federal government says the federal
- 7 government will pick up the costs of that. So
- 8 there is already federal dollars going into
- 9 railroad systems.
- 10 Again, Congress has decided that's how it
- 11 should be done. If it's a highway relocation, the
- 12 local government picks it up. So on these things
- 13 Congress is deciding where the money is going to
- 14 go, and I think Rich's answer really addressed
- 15 that there.
- 16 Bill, did you have a question yet? We
- 17 got that one answered. Anyone else? Okay.
- 18 Questions from anyone else? If you can,
- 19 again, use the mike so the reporter can get it
- 20 recorded. We'd sure appreciate that.
- 21 MR. WIEDMAN: As we get questions from
- 22 the floor, let me just say these are requests for
- 23 information, such as we've had so far, or maybe
- 24 clarification rather than just a rhetorical
- 25 statement of your opinion. We'll move to that

- 1 into the fourth and last part of the evening.
- 2 So what Gary will do is field your
- 3 question and see who's best qualified to answer.
- 4 Gary.
- 5 UNIDENTIFIED WORKSHOP PARTICIPANT: I
- 6 think you did a very nice job of explaining who
- 7 pays for this. I'd like to know who reaps the
- 8 economic benefit of our taxpayer dollars?
- 9 MR. LOSS: Good question. Rich. I think
- 10 that question has come up at all four meetings, so
- 11 we'll see how Rich does tonight.
- 12 CORPS PERSONNEL: I think the answer to
- 13 the question is that a number of groups share in
- 14 the benefits that we're estimating here. The
- 15 shipper, to some degree; the consumer of the final
- 16 product, to some degree; the producer, to some
- 17 degree; the farmer and users. I think I've
- 18 already mentioned that.
- 19 So the answer is: It's a shared benefits
- 20 by a number of publics.
- 21 UNIDENTIFIED WORKSHOP PARTICIPANT: Could
- 22 you expand on that a little bit? Could you
- 23 explain to me how the farmer benefits from that;
- 24 how it's -- Is it mandated that the powers that be
- 25 share some of the profit with them?

1 CORPS PERSONNEL: The degree to which any

- 2 group shares in the benefits that are produced is
- 3 really a function of the marketplace.
- 4 UNIDENTIFIED WORKSHOP PARTICIPANT: Thank
- 5 you. That's enough.
- 6 MR. WIEDMAN: Okay. Other questions?
- 7 UNIDENTIFIED WORKSHOP PARTICIPANT: Well,
- 8 I have an ecological question. I think that
- 9 there's a lot of presumptions here about the
- 10 amount of water that's in the system. You know,
- 11 everything you've said tonight, all these plans,
- 12 other than Plan A, presumes that there's going to
- 13 be sufficient hydrological action.
- We are in a situation of global warming.
- 15 There is -- This is a limited supply all over the
- 16 planet, and the U.S. is not immune. Water
- 17 supplies, water tables are declining; they're
- 18 deteriorating.
- 19 MR. WIEDMAN: And your question is?
- 20 UNIDENTIFIED WORKSHOP PARTICIPANT: And
- 21 the question is: What will -- How will your
- 22 little plans from B on address the reality of what
- 23 could happen? Again, what would inevitably happen
- 24 again when what we had happen in 1988 happened
- 25 again; that is, the drying up of the Mississippi

- 1 in the lower regions? And it could be this time
- 2 higher; you know, higher up. How is this going to
- 3 really address this?
- 4 MR. WIEDMAN: How does the plan
- 5 consider --
- 6 UNIDENTIFIED WORKSHOP PARTICIPANT: I
- 7 don't think you can address the question. I'm
- 8 interested in the answer, though.
- 9 CORPS PERSONNEL: Actually, the whole
- 10 issue of global warming is a very interesting one;
- 11 however, the cumulative impacts group that we put
- 12 together, when we try to figure out what's
- 13 happened to these lakes, rivers in the last 50
- 14 years, Jim Knox actually was a geologist -- or
- 15 geomorphologist. So he wanted the group to go
- 16 back 20,000 years to try and understand why the
- 17 river looks the way it does.
- 18 After some time the engineers and
- 19 hydrologists had some patience with him, and they
- 20 did go through the whole episodic global warming
- 21 and so on and so forth as it relates to why the
- 22 river looked like it did in the thirties before we
- 23 put dams on it, and how that has some effect
- 24 certainly as it relates to land use and runoff and
- 25 sedimentation even in the last 50 years.

1 Your question specifically is how we

- 2 operate the lock and dam systems in times of
- 3 drought, and with all of these plans you see up
- 4 there, including the no-action plan, B, we really
- 5 aren't considering alternative operating plans.
- 6 We basically are assuming that we'll continue to
- 7 operate the lock and dam system just like we are
- 8 today.
- 9 So any problems we had in the past with
- 10 drought, we would also have again. Bill, I don't
- 11 know if you have anything specific. Do you go
- 12 into a certain mode?
- 13 CORPS PERSONNEL: No. There's no
- 14 difference; no difference in our operation.
- 15 CORPS PERSONNEL: So basically we're
- 16 not -- I've heard the op people tell me this
- 17 before, but the low-end dams are really not set up
- 18 to store water.
- 19 It's not like on the Missouri where they
- 20 hold headwaters and release it. These dams are
- 21 not set up for that, so it is pretty much stuck.
- MR. LOSS: One of the misconceptions is
- 23 that our navigation dams can do something with
- 24 flood control as far as holding back water.
- 25 There's so much water that comes down the

1 Mississippi River that basically we just create a

- 2 pool with it, and it passes on through. And
- 3 thinking back to '88-89 in the drought period, on
- 4 the Upper Mississippi we had no problem
- 5 maintaining pools. There was enough water to keep
- 6 going.
- With the improvements we're talking
- 8 about, whether they're 1200-foot locks or 600-foot
- 9 locks, it really doesn't make any difference how
- 10 much water is coming down the river. If we have a
- 11 dry river, if we have really severe drought, we'll
- 12 have that problem regardless of the plan that
- 13 we're looking at.
- 14 UNIDENTIFIED WORKSHOP PARTICIPANT: I'm
- 15 concerned about the size of farms in Iowa. We're
- 16 losing small farms, and we're seeing the farm size
- 17 increase, and it's really hard for young farmers
- 18 to get started.
- 19 Does the Corps think it's appropriate to
- 20 study how an increase in barge traffic will affect
- 21 size of farms in Iowa?
- MR. LOSS: We really don't get into
- 23 that. We're looking at -- Picking up on some
- 24 things that Rich said there, we're looking at what
- 25 the delays are at the locks and dams and how we

1 can reduce those delays, what the benefits are for

- 2 reducing those delays really irregardless of how
- 3 big the farmer is that produced the corn that came
- 4 on the barge that comes through our lock and dam.
- 5 So really we're not into that.
- 6 UNIDENTIFIED WORKSHOP PARTICIPANT: A
- 7 question about TMDLs. Does anybody here know
- 8 about TMDLs and how this is all going to interact
- 9 with the Clean Water Act?
- 10 States are having to list the waters that
- 11 aren't meeting their uses on an impaired waters
- 12 list, and those -- and the Mississippi, parts of
- 13 the Mississippi have been cited as not meeting
- 14 water quality standards in their uses.
- 15 So what impact do you guys think that the
- 16 TMDL process will have on barge traffic?
- 17 CORPS PERSONNEL: I'm not specifically
- 18 familiar with that acronym. I'll mention one
- 19 thing: We were concerned about contaminants and
- 20 toxic resuspension. So we do have -- A lot of the
- 21 models and the likes have looked at how our
- 22 sediments are resuspended when a barge goes
- 23 through a main channel, and then where those
- 24 sediments go. But the vast majority of the
- 25 system -- We'll talk about main channel sands,

1 which really don't hold the contaminants like the

- 2 silts do.
- 3 There are some chronic areas on the
- 4 Illinois River that we have identified, and we'll
- 5 be looking at existing information of the likes
- 6 and discussing what the possible fate of that
- 7 material will be with increased traffic.
- 8 Rich, did you have anything to add to
- 9 that?
- 10 CORPS PERSONNEL: I guess the only thing
- 11 I might add is there's a broad-based plan that was
- 12 actually spearheaded by the Environmental
- 13 Protection Agency, Clean Water Action Plan, and
- 14 that plan specifically addresses that issue in
- 15 terms of, as you mentioned, impaired waters and
- 16 the states listing those. They're trying to
- 17 identify those waters that are most -- not at
- 18 risk, but most impaired and most in need of some
- 19 kind of corrective action.
- 20 So it's being addressed but in basically
- 21 another area, and the Corps of Engineers isn't a
- 22 participating agency in that plan.
- 23 UNIDENTIFIED WORKSHOP PARTICIPANT: The
- 24 Corps of Engineers has put together a very
- 25 comprehensive report here this evening on why they

1 would like to expand locks and dams to show the

- 2 cost-effectiveness of sending our Iowa products by
- 3 barge.
- 4 There are also studies that show that the
- 5 rail system is really more cost-effective than
- 6 barges, and I would like to know which entity has
- 7 invited you to come to make this presentation, and
- 8 if that same entity would not allow as much time
- 9 and as much effort and as much probably taxpayers'
- 10 money to get a report to us general citizenry on
- 11 the rail system.
- 12 MR. LOSS: I'll let Rich address the rate
- 13 issue, but as far as who invited us tonight,
- 14 basically the study that we're doing, the 50-some
- 15 million dollar study is authorized by Congress to
- 16 take a look at changed conditions on projects that
- 17 we operate.
- 18 And we operate the Upper Mississippi
- 19 River Illinois Waterway Navigation System, and
- 20 as I said in the presentation, things have
- 21 changed. We've got -- Tows are much longer, much
- 22 more traffic, and so we're taking a look at that
- 23 seeing whether we need to increase the capacity of
- 24 the system or not. That's a matter of benefits
- 25 and costs, and that's what we're analyzing.

1 So as far as who invited us here to

- 2 Des Moines tonight, we've got a series of seven
- 3 public meetings. We have a system with the
- 4 Governors Liaison Committee where there are five
- 5 states which have a representative.
- 6 I introduced Jim Hall here tonight, and
- 7 Jill Hall was one that said, "Please come to
- 8 Des Moines to make a presentation so people in
- 9 this part of the state have knowledge of what's
- 10 going on in the navigation study."
- 11 UNIDENTIFIED WORKSHOP PARTICIPANT: Who
- 12 is Jim Hall?
- 13 CORPS PERSONNEL: Jim Hall is with the
- 14 Iowa DOT.
- 15 UNIDENTIFIED WORKSHOP PARTICIPANT: Jim,
- 16 would you try to get some kind of group together
- 17 to make a presentation on the rail system and what
- 18 the benefit would be that way?
- 19 MR. HALL: Okay. I would love to do. I
- 20 simply do not have the authority to do that.
- I think, from a transportation
- 22 perspective to Iowa, both a viable river
- 23 transportation system and a viable rail
- 24 transportation system is important to Iowa.
- 25 UNIDENTIFIED WORKSHOP PARTICIPANT: We're

1 only hearing about the river system, and I think

- 2 we should have some equal time on the rail
- 3 system.
- 4 MR. HALL: I do understand we are only
- 5 hearing about the river system. The Corps'
- 6 authority only allows them to study the river
- 7 system.
- 8 MR. WIEDMAN: So your question, I guess,
- 9 ma'am, is: Who would be the authority to
- 10 investigate to the same depth the railroad?
- 11 My understanding would be that would be
- 12 an authorization through the Department of
- 13 Transportation, them getting marching orders; is
- 14 that right? Congress or the State government
- 15 would authorize you to take a look at that?
- 16 MR. HALL: I think that is a good
- 17 answer.
- 18 UNIDENTIFIED WORKSHOP PARTICIPANT: I'd
- 19 also like to make an observation.
- In our group that met, we had a great
- 21 many farmers speaking out and environmentalists
- 22 speaking out and combinations of the two.
- 23 There's a third group here, the
- 24 corporations -- Cargill and ADM and ConAgra -- and
- 25 those -- There was no participation from them. It

- 1 makes me a little bit disturbed.
- 2 Are we being asked to participate and
- 3 give our opinions and our comments on things, and
- 4 then when it comes time for campaign finances, are
- 5 the big corporations going to give their campaign
- 6 contributions, and all our work is going to go for
- 7 not?
- 8 CORPS PERSONNEL: Let me step back just a
- 9 minute and answer or try to address one part of
- 10 the observation that you made a little bit earlier
- 11 about the railroads.
- 12 In doing our study in measuring the
- 13 transportation efficiencies, which ultimately are
- 14 the benefits for the various measures that were
- 15 described here tonight, we have specifically
- 16 considered the costs of moving various commodities
- 17 by rail as well as the capacity of the rail
- 18 system.
- 19 So it isn't as though rail has been
- 20 ignored here. Rail was very much a part of the
- 21 process of doing this evaluation of overall
- 22 transportation efficiency.
- 23 It ties it in a little bit to what we
- 24 said earlier in that while we do study aspects of
- 25 the railroad, when it's all said and done, the

- 1 Corps doesn't have any authority to recommend
- 2 improvements or changes to the rail system, but
- 3 the rail is studied when we make our benefit
- 4 estimates.
- 5 MR. LOSS: As far as who's speaking at
- 6 these public meetings, I guess I really can't
- 7 address who's talking in the work groups or not.
- 8 We've publicized these workshops as far and wide
- 9 as we could.
- 10 Mailing lists to 2,000 newsletters went
- 11 out, and so we've invited as many people as
- 12 possible to come. We've tried to set up a format
- 13 that encourages everybody can participate and be
- 14 heard, and the Corps is deliberately staying out
- 15 of the breakout rooms, because we don't want to be
- 16 in there biasing the reaction.
- 17 So I'm not sure exactly who is talking
- 18 and who's not. There's no plan there that
- 19 somebody speaks and somebody doesn't. Hopefully
- 20 everyone is being heard.
- 21 UNIDENTIFIED WORKSHOP PARTICIPANT: You
- 22 mentioned earlier that mitigation costs will be in
- 23 the final draft. Will that include the possible
- 24 increase and monetary loss of the Gulf of Mexico
- 25 fisheries and tourism caused by an increase in

1 construction upstream in the Mississippi and

- 2 increases in barge traffic and increased
- 3 sedimentation from shoreline erosion?
- 4 I notice that your cost analysis here
- 5 does not include any mitigation costs because you
- 6 don't know what they are yet. Aren't we a little
- 7 premature in putting down this chart at all
- 8 without knowing those mitigation costs?
- 9 MR. LOSS: I'll take the first part of
- 10 that and then let Ken follow up as to where we're
- 11 headed with the system costs.
- 12 As far as the public meetings being
- 13 premature, we hoped we would have more information
- 14 tonight on the system costs than what we do. We
- 15 were working on some of the economic issues. It
- 16 took us longer than we thought.
- 17 Several months ago we made arrangements
- 18 for the public meetings, all of the meeting
- 19 locations, and it's a major logistical challenge
- 20 to do that. We decided that we would go forward
- 21 with the information that we've got, the
- 22 alternatives we've got, and we would ask the
- 23 public what you think about the alternatives, and
- 24 we would all learn from that.
- 25 Again, we would have liked to have more

1 information on the system environmental costs, but

- 2 honestly, we just don't have it yet. In a couple
- 3 months we will, and Ken, if you want to follow up
- 4 with some daily field precedent.
- 5 CORPS PERSONNEL: Actually, the
- 6 alternatives evaluation really is kind of a
- 7 feedback process. Rich Manguno of the economics
- 8 workgroup had to get done with this alternatives
- 9 analysis you saw on this matrix in order to hand
- 10 off to us how each of those alternatives might
- 11 affect traffic in the future.
- 12 The biggest impact we're concerned with
- 13 between the locks and dams is the impacts from
- 14 increased barge traffic. Until we have the
- 15 economic analysis complete, we really don't get a
- 16 handle on: Are we going to go from eight boats a
- 17 day in Pool 13 to ten boats a day in Pool 13?
- 18 Like you might have quidewall
- 19 extensions. Are you going to go to eight boats a
- 20 day in Pool 13 perhaps all the way up to 12 boats
- 21 a day? Then I can take those numbers -- that's
- 22 what we're doing now with my team -- and then
- 23 determine or estimate what the environmental
- 24 consequences of that are.
- 25 So this alternatives evaluation really is

1 a feedback process, which you guys happen to be

- 2 right in the middle of now. So we felt it was
- 3 still important to come to the public.
- 4 You had a couple of points particularly
- 5 about bank erosion and backwater sedimentation,
- 6 and these are two of the resource areas of concern
- 7 that we have studied. We've identified where on
- 8 the system we're likely to see increased bank
- 9 erosion as a result of increased traffic, and
- 10 those has been mapped out for the entire
- 11 Mississippi and Illinois waterway.
- 12 Our second step with that is to say: So
- 13 what? If we do have erosion, are we losing bottom
- 14 forests? Are we losing roost trees for eagles,
- 15 heron roostings? Is it affecting a levee? Is it
- 16 affecting a downtown park?
- 17 So we've used our DIS to overlay the
- 18 erosion areas with the land use to get a handle on
- 19 what would be impacted if we did have increased
- 20 erosion here, and that's all that will be
- 21 presented in the DIS, and in fact, we have some of
- 22 that information here tonight, if you're
- 23 interested after the meeting.
- 24 The second had to do with sedimentation,
- 25 and both erosion as well as sediment resuspension

1 from the main channel are potential contributors

- 2 to backwater erosion. And so what we have done
- 3 is, based upon the distance to the opening of
- 4 backwaters and side channels from the sailing line
- 5 as well as the types of material we find near
- 6 these openings, if it's silt or sand, we've
- 7 identified hot spots on the system where we think
- 8 increased traffic will contribute to backwater
- 9 sedimentation, and we will propose ways to help
- 10 protect those areas in the future.
- 11 MR. LOSS: Did you mention Gulf of
- 12 Mexico?
- 13 CORPS PERSONNEL: The hypoxia issue? Is
- 14 that nutrient loading to the Gulf of Mexico and
- 15 the likes?
- 16 That's not a specific component of this
- 17 study. Again, for all of the Alternatives A
- 18 through F, you see they are not proposing any
- 19 changes in the way we operate the locks and dams
- 20 themselves. So we don't anticipate any of these
- 21 would make a difference in how nutrients basically
- 22 are transported from the Upper Mississippi River
- 23 to the Gulf of Mexico.
- 24 It's an important issue in other studies
- 25 and other agencies, including the Corps, by

- 1 looking at it also.
- 2 UNIDENTIFIED WORKSHOP PARTICIPANT:
- 3 You're saying that's not connected; that's not a
- 4 part?
- 5 MR. WIEDMAN: That's not a part of this
- 6 study, this particular study.
- 7 CORPS PERSONNEL: I certainly acknowledge
- 8 that the flow of nutrients and water from the
- 9 Upper Mississippi River to New Orleans is a source
- 10 of nutrient loading and hypoxia.
- 11 UNIDENTIFIED WORKSHOP PARTICIPANT:
- 12 What's going to be the largest increased commodity
- 13 going down that river? Why are we going to expand
- 14 that navigation system?
- This isn't artificial separation. We're
- 16 talking corn and soybeans here. Come on. Where
- 17 are the nutrients coming from?
- 18 CORPS PERSONNEL: Is that your question?
- 19 UNIDENTIFIED WORKSHOP PARTICIPANT: No.
- 20 I have one, but go ahead. You're up.
- 21 Absolutely.
- 22 UNIDENTIFIED WORKSHOP PARTICIPANT: I
- 23 just have a quick question concerning the
- 24 estimates on total crop production. I have a
- 25 booklet here that shows USDA numbers on soybeans.

1 I work with the soybean industry. In

- 2 1972 the U.S. produced 1.2 billion bushels of
- 3 soybeans, and this year we're probably going to be
- 4 close to 2.9. Looking at some of these estimates,
- 5 I guess we've almost increased our production 150
- 6 percent over -- since 1972, and looking at some of
- 7 the estimates and some of the concerns, we're
- 8 going to see that production trendline, I think,
- 9 become a little bit steeper.
- 10 What were some of the considerations
- 11 taken into looking at trendline production, yield
- 12 productions? We're on the verge of making a
- 13 3 billion bushel crop. This year I think we're
- 14 going to be close to 2.9, like I said earlier. If
- 15 we didn't have a drought in the eastern cornbelt,
- 16 we would easily be at 3 billion bushels.
- 17 I guess, how steep is that production
- 18 trendline, I'm curious, or what are some of the
- 19 factors that went into it?
- 20 CORPS PERSONNEL: Your question is
- 21 focused on yields specifically?
- 22 UNIDENTIFIED WORKSHOP PARTICIPANT:
- 23 Essentially, yes.
- 24 CORPS PERSONNEL: For both corn and
- 25 soybeans, the contractor that did the production

1 and traffic projections for us looked at a couple

- 2 of periods of time in trying to use history to
- 3 project something about what might be expected in
- 4 the future regarding yields.
- 5 There are two scenarios specifically that
- 6 are evaluated in the report. One uses a longer
- 7 period of time; about 25 years or so, I believe.
- 8 It produces a somewhat lower slope to the
- 9 projection line that you're talking about that
- 10 would show what the rate of increase in the yields
- 11 are.
- 12 They also developed another scenario that
- 13 looks at a shorter period of time, and over that
- 14 period of time, the actual yield growth has been
- 15 more rapid. And that scenario, along with the
- 16 longer-term scenario of 25 years to measure what
- 17 the yields are, will both be evaluated ultimately
- 18 in the study.
- 19 UNIDENTIFIED WORKSHOP PARTICIPANT: I'm
- 20 just afraid that, looking at some of the research
- 21 that's being done and some of the new production
- 22 technologies that are out there, I think we're
- 23 going to be doubling this crop sooner than most
- 24 people expected, and we are concerned about
- 25 surpluses right now.

1 We have 300 million bushels over, I

- 2 guess, surplus, and we need to move that somewhere
- 3 in one form or another, be it value-added or
- 4 whatever.
- 5 So I want to make that a part of the
- 6 record, and I'm a little concerned and the soybean
- 7 industry is concerned about conservative estimates
- 8 on production. Thank you.
- 9 UNIDENTIFIED WORKSHOP PARTICIPANT: Could
- 10 I do a follow-up question on that? I would like
- 11 to also ask: What's the projections for
- 12 government policy in commodity organizations
- 13 succeeding at value-added activities; therefore,
- 14 converting more of our bulk products into
- 15 value-added activities that would actually be
- 16 shipped by rail or flown by air to export
- 17 markets?
- 18 I would be very concerned if we weren't
- 19 equally optimistic on value-added as we are on
- 20 increasing production. So what projections are
- 21 you using for value-added that would reduce the
- 22 amount of bulk commodities going down the river
- 23 but still maintain export economies?
- 24 CORPS PERSONNEL: To try to capture your
- 25 question -- I think I've got the thrust of it

1 essentially -- is that the recent term, with

- 2 respect to value-added developments, is
- 3 essentially what the traffic projections and the
- 4 production numbers ultimately are based on?
- 5 The report that specifically addresses
- 6 the details of this is included on the web page
- 7 and goes into some detail in explaining those
- 8 particular assumptions that that's based on.
- 9 MR. LOSS: I think one of the things you
- 10 mentioned there was as far as production rates and
- 11 then the part of that's transported is the part
- 12 that we're looking at. And one of the challenges
- 13 we've had over the last year is trying to figure
- 14 out how much of these commodities are going to be
- 15 shipped.
- 16 And when we're dealing with grain from
- 17 Iowa, there's a whole lot of choices there. The
- 18 elevator is a choice. The farmer has a choice
- 19 whether he processes it or he feeds it to hogs or
- 20 he ships it to the Pacific Northwest or down the
- 21 Mississippi.
- 22 In trying to make those predictions in
- 23 how much is going to come down the Mississippi and
- 24 is going to be shipped down there is what we've
- 25 been working with. It's more complex than just

1 projecting what the production rates are going to

- 2 be.
- 3 UNIDENTIFIED WORKSHOP PARTICIPANT: One
- 4 of the exciting things that happened in our
- 5 group -- there was a real plurality of opinions --
- 6 was some discussion on creativity and imagination.
- 7 So my question is: How much
- 8 investigation in your research went into even
- 9 asking the question of: Instead of expanding or
- 10 modifying the river but studying and modifying the
- 11 vessels, the barges that are actually on the
- 12 river, and what were the considerations that went
- 13 into making the choices about researching that or
- 14 not researching it? You, obviously, didn't share
- 15 that with us, if that was the case.
- MR. LOSS: We talked about screening. We
- 17 could be here for another four or five hours
- 18 talking about that.
- 19 Dave or Denny, do either one of you want
- 20 to give some insights into some of this?
- 21 CORPS PERSONNEL: Early on in the study,
- 22 we got together with the Coast Guard, navigation
- 23 industry, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, EPA,
- 24 several State resource agencies, and we got
- 25 together and did exactly what you're talking

- 1 about. Anything was possible.
- We said, "What can we do to get the
- 3 traffic to go down the river faster?" We looked
- 4 at our structures ourselves. We looked at some
- 5 scheduling programs that Dave Tipple talked
- 6 about.
- We also looked at industry items. What
- 8 could they do faster? And there's actually a lot
- 9 of initiatives that the industry has undertaken on
- 10 their own to decrease the amount of time it takes
- 11 them to get through the system, because it's more
- 12 money in their pocket. So we did look at that.
- I have a report up here. There's a
- 14 mountain of data in here, and it's available to
- 15 anybody in this room or the general public. If
- 16 you're interested in looking at that, we can get
- 17 you a copy of that.
- 18 UNIDENTIFIED WORKSHOP PARTICIPANT: This
- 19 is kind of a follow-up question to this gentleman's
- 20 question and that gentleman's question. Who was
- 21 the independent contractor who looked at the
- 22 future commodities and its movement? Who was
- 23 that?
- 24 MR. LOSS: Fossett & Associates, who
- 25 subbed out grain projections, as far as

- 1 transportation, to Sparks Associates.
- 2 UNIDENTIFIED WORKSHOP PARTICIPANT: Tell
- 3 us who they are and what they do.
- 4 CORPS PERSONNEL: Jack Fossett &
- 5 Associates was the firm that had the contract to
- 6 do the traffic projections. They engaged a number
- 7 of subcontractors to do specific commodity
- 8 groups. They hired Sparks Company to do the
- 9 projections regarding grain and agricultural
- 10 products.
- 11 UNIDENTIFIED WORKSHOP PARTICIPANT: Would
- 12 I be right in assuming that these are the people
- 13 that are responsible for not contacting the
- 14 economic development offices from Iowa and the
- 15 other four states? Because that relates to your
- 16 value-added question.
- 17 I asked this question before. They are
- 18 the ones, and then you did not identify that
- 19 yourselves? Because what they're talking about is
- 20 a major part of the future.
- I mean, Vilsack, that's his flag,
- 22 value-added, and yet, somehow you seem to overlook
- 23 this in particular.
- 24 CORPS PERSONNEL: Well, I don't believe
- 25 that's actually the case. The study process

- 1 involved representation from each of the five
- 2 states on the economic coordinating committees.
- 3 The states had the option or the ability to
- 4 designate anybody that they wanted to participate
- 5 in that process. So the --
- 6 UNIDENTIFIED WORKSHOP PARTICIPANT: It's
- 7 oversight on somebody's part somewhere, but at any
- 8 rate, they didn't participate. I talked to the
- 9 Iowa Economic Development Office yesterday, and
- 10 they were not contacted. They haven't been a part
- 11 of this at all.
- 12 They did appear, however, at a summit, an
- 13 economic summit that was put on by MARC 2000 about
- 14 this very issue down in Davenport, and when the
- 15 director gave his speech, you could have heard a
- 16 pin drop in the place, and obviously, he wasn't
- 17 invited back into the process.
- 18 I have a second question.
- 19 CORPS PERSONNEL: I guess just real quick
- 20 I know Dick Viggers from the State of Iowa's
- 21 Economic Development Office has participated in a
- 22 number of meetings on the nav study as well as two
- 23 of the other states' development offices. But
- 24 certainly, for the economic supporting committee,
- 25 the states have appointed other staff outside the

- 1 development offices.
- 2 UNIDENTIFIED WORKSHOP PARTICIPANT: They
- 3 didn't mention that to me yesterday.
- 4 Where is this stuff going that's going
- 5 down the river? I mean, we have this vague notion
- 6 and you tell us about how much is exported and all
- 7 this, but in order for the public to have a grasp
- 8 of what's going on here, we need to know more than
- 9 it's just 60 to 80 percent corn and 10 percent of
- 10 this and 10 percent of that.
- 11 Where is it going, and what is it doing?
- 12 We're hearing --
- MR. WIEDMAN: That's your question,
- 14 Michael; is where is the product going?
- 15 UNIDENTIFIED WORKSHOP PARTICIPANT:
- 16 Yeah. Where is that corn and soybean specifically
- 17 going to? Where's it coming from? How is it
- 18 being used and consumed?
- 19 CORPS PERSONNEL: I can give you rough
- 20 percentages on that. The traffic that goes
- 21 downriver, of the traffic that goes downriver
- 22 about 70 percent of that winds up going to the Far
- 23 East, Asian countries. The other 30 percent goes
- 24 primarily to Europe and, to a smaller degree, to
- 25 African countries.

1 UNIDENTIFIED WORKSHOP PARTICIPANT:

- 2 Purchases? These countries are purchasing it?
- 3 CORPS PERSONNEL: Yes.
- 4 UNIDENTIFIED WORKSHOP PARTICIPANT: This
- 5 is not foreign aid type things?
- 6 CORPS PERSONNEL: There may be a small
- 7 component of aid in there, but it's essentially
- 8 purchases.
- 9 UNIDENTIFIED WORKSHOP PARTICIPANT: I
- 10 know there's an enormous number of federal
- 11 agencies in New Orleans. I don't know what goes
- 12 on at that seaport down there. But 70 percent to
- 13 Asian countries?
- 14 CORPS PERSONNEL: That's an approximate
- 15 percentage, yes. I think that's pretty close.
- 16 UNIDENTIFIED WORKSHOP PARTICIPANT: I
- 17 have a third question. I guess I don't know who
- 18 would take this one, but when you talk about "the
- 19 system," exactly what are you talking about?
- 20 Where does "the system" begin and end here? Does
- 21 "the system" end on the banks? Does it include
- 22 the tributaries?
- 23 CORPS PERSONNEL: I guess the answer to
- 24 that question is it depends within the context of
- 25 the specific question. Earlier we were talking

1 about costs to maintain and operate the system.

- 2 In that context "the system" is the Mississippi
- 3 River above Lock 27 and the entire Illinois
- 4 waterway.
- 5 UNIDENTIFIED WORKSHOP PARTICIPANT: To
- 6 the banks up to the tributaries? I mean, we have
- 7 a silt problem here, and most of that is coming
- 8 down the tributaries.
- 9 Are the tributaries part of the system,
- 10 or does it end at the bank?
- 11 CORPS PERSONNEL: In the corn groups
- 12 part -- the system study considers corn not
- 13 necessarily grown in between the bank lines. It
- 14 depends on the question.
- 15 CORPS PERSONNEL: That's what I was
- 16 trying to suggest earlier. It really depends
- 17 specifically within the context of a specific
- 18 question, "What is the system?"
- 19 CORPS PERSONNEL: Maybe, Mike, back to
- 20 your question in the doorway earlier, which is a
- 21 really good question, is: How might these
- 22 alternatives induce farmers to change their land
- 23 use on their land? I think that's a really good
- 24 question.
- 25 I think a context for that -- and I don't

1 have the numbers with me, but a good context for

- 2 that is: Of all the agriculture production of
- 3 corn and soybeans in a given state, how much of
- 4 that actually does end up on the waterway today?
- 5 Do you even have a rough estimate of that
- 6 percentage, Rich?
- 7 CORPS PERSONNEL: From recollection Iowa
- 8 is about 20 percent of the total productionwise.
- 9 CORPS PERSONNEL: So 20 percent of total
- 10 production ends up on the waterway. If we have
- 11 incremental improvement in efficiency to shave so
- 12 much per bushel off of that 20 percent, will that
- 13 cause farmers to make a decision to take land out
- 14 of set aside or crop their lands differently,
- 15 which would then, in turn, add to the erosion
- 16 problem, add to the loss of grasses and prairies
- 17 in the border areas, worms in the border areas? I
- 18 think that's the gist of your question.
- 19 UNIDENTIFIED WORKSHOP PARTICIPANT: Also,
- 20 the lady asked the question about nutrient
- 21 loading, and to say that isn't part of this, when
- 22 corn and soybeans are the major factor in this
- 23 whole business of increased navigation, I think
- 24 that's an appropriate question here.
- 25 CORPS PERSONNEL: It is an appropriate

1 question, and I think we deserve -- we should give

- 2 that more thought as we go forward.
- 3 UNIDENTIFIED WORKSHOP PARTICIPANT: Another
- 4 lady asked about TMDLs. Now, every -- This is not
- 5 a position statement or comment. This is a
- 6 question.
- 7 Every stream in the state of Iowa is on
- 8 the threatened endangered list because of nutrient
- 9 loading, every one. And this lady and I and other
- 10 people, three parties, are involved in a lawsuit
- 11 against the EPA and the State of Iowa over TMDLs.
- 12 This is directly related to corn and soybeans
- 13 going down that river.
- 14 CORPS PERSONNEL: Again, the question is:
- 15 With these incremental improvements and moving the
- 16 commodities, will that induce a change in land use
- 17 on the system?
- 18 UNIDENTIFIED WORKSHOP PARTICIPANT: No,
- 19 that's not the question. Here's the question.
- 20 Why aren't worms and bacteria and other
- 21 species in those fields included in this
- 22 environmental impact study so that we can get a
- 23 grip? There isn't a farmer in this room that
- 24 doesn't thinks worms are essential to their
- 25 process, but I think they're being misled. So why

- 1 don't get this down?
- I have worked for five years, and MARC
- 3 2000 went along with this. And then on the last
- 4 meeting of the Big River Partnership, they pulled
- 5 the word "improve" out of the vision statement. I
- 6 believe you were there up in Minneapolis.
- 7 They pulled that word in the very last
- 8 meeting. We're no longer going to improve the
- 9 biotic potential of watershed. We're going to
- 10 sustain it. In other words, if there's no
- 11 worms there now, well, fine. We don't need them
- 12 in the future.
- MR. WIEDMAN: We're moving more now away
- 14 from what this focus is, which is question-and-
- 15 answer, because we're getting outside of the scope
- 16 of it.
- 17 UNIDENTIFIED WORKSHOP PARTICIPANT: Did
- 18 you get the question? Why isn't that involved?
- 19 Is it the banks? Is it the tributaries? Is it
- 20 the docks, or is it -- Is everything else
- 21 involved?
- 22 CORPS PERSONNEL: Where we draw the lines
- 23 for potential impacts is where we think evaluation
- 24 of these alternatives makes a difference. Is
- 25 there going to be a difference in land use between

1 no action alternatives and 22 locks on the

- 2 system? Good question.
- 3 The second area we draw the line is:
- 4 Where will increased traffic cause effects? There
- 5 most of the impacts are between the bank lines.
- 6 We've added the bank erosion problem and
- 7 terrestrial resources that may be affected by bank
- 8 erosion, but our biggest concern is evaluating
- 9 alternatives. Where might we see significant
- 10 changes between one alternative and the other?
- 11 And that doesn't allow us necessarily to
- 12 venture off into other real important questions
- 13 that really aren't relevant to that decision
- 14 between alternatives.
- 15 UNIDENTIFIED WORKSHOP PARTICIPANT: You
- 16 get my question here? I asked this question for
- 17 five years. I went down and talked to the head of
- 18 Army Corps of Engineers and got blocked from
- 19 getting on the boat. I wrote this question down
- 20 twice on a piece of paper here at these meetings,
- 21 and it didn't get read off.
- MR. WIEDMAN: My sense is he answered the
- 23 question. Maybe not to your --
- 24 UNIDENTIFIED WORKSHOP PARTICIPANT: I
- 25 want the question to go to the higher-ups, and on

1 the next round I need to have it addressed, and

- 2 you best be ready for this.
- 3 MR. WIEDMAN: Well, he's addressed it to
- 4 the degree he can. I think he's just answered
- 5 your question. He's answered the question twice.
- 6 It's in the record. It will be
- 7 reviewed.
- 8 UNIDENTIFIED WORKSHOP PARTICIPANT: One
- 9 more question.
- 10 MR. WIEDMAN: As long as it's not another
- 11 statement. We'll get into that in a minute.
- 12 UNIDENTIFIED WORKSHOP PARTICIPANT: We're
- 13 talking about economic viability and environmental
- 14 integrity. Is 2 percent of a fish's ability to
- 15 spawn, you know, 2 percent increased mortality,
- 16 now is that environmental integrity?
- Where do we have it? Is it 3 percent?
- 18 Is it zero percent? Are we talking getting a
- 19 handle on where the environment on this ecosystem
- 20 is right now and keeping it right there, or are we
- 21 going to be satisfied with a little slide each
- 22 year?
- What does "integrity" mean? That's my
- 24 last question.
- 25 CORPS PERSONNEL: We're concerned with

1 it, and it comes down to a very difficult question

- 2 of significance. What is the significant impact?
- 3 The 2 percent that you are citing has to
- 4 do with of all the larval fish that we estimate
- 5 are out in the main channel, on the average about
- 6 three per cubic meter, and there's a lot of cubic
- 7 meters of water out there.
- 8 We have certain estimates of densities of
- 9 different species in the main channel. We
- 10 estimate with the doubling in traffic that 2
- 11 percent of all those larval fish in the main
- 12 channel might be killed.
- Now, the important biological question
- 14 there is: What does a 2 percent loss of larval
- 15 fish mean, since probably 1 out of 1,000 of those
- 16 are going to survive to adulthood anyway? So what
- 17 we've done is ecological modeling.
- 18 Actually, we have worked in the
- 19 equivalent adult loss and recruitment foregone,
- 20 and so what we do is work in life history of these
- 21 species and some of all the larval fish out there;
- 22 how much would survive to adulthood. So of a
- 23 2 percent loss, how many survived to adulthood.
- 24 That gives Pool 13 -- With doubling of
- 25 traffic you may see 60 less recruits in the year

1 2030, and then we basically have a situation where

- 2 we can compare that with how does that compare,
- 3 perhaps, with the sports fishery? How does that
- 4 compare with what the commercial fishermen are
- 5 taking out? Is this a significant impact?
- 6 I can tell you that I think certainly for
- 7 some of the fisheries' impacts we are going to
- 8 definitely look at ways to minimize those impacts,
- 9 and I think for some of those we are also going to
- 10 be looking at ways to improve the habitat to help
- 11 replace some of the those fish that will be
- 12 killed.
- 13 For other resources, when you say a
- 14 figure of up to 2 percent loss in the biomass of a
- 15 certain plant bed, again, those plant beds were
- 16 not threatening their ability to reproduce. They
- 17 considered what happened to the tubers, the plants
- 18 that come back up in same place regardless if we
- 19 have 12 boats a day in Pool 13 or eight boats at a
- 20 time in Pool 13. In that instance we're going to
- 21 suggest that's not a significant impact.
- 22 So those are important considerations and
- 23 part of the exact process we're going through
- 24 right now.
- 25 UNIDENTIFIED WORKSHOP PARTICIPANT: So if

1 you go species by species here, quantifying that,

- 2 it makes no sense having cutoffs, since it's
- 3 failing here. We know the difficulty of this
- 4 project in trying to quantify this ecosystem.
- 5 MR. WIEDMAN: I'd like to make sure --
- 6 UNIDENTIFIED WORKSHOP PARTICIPANT: Is
- 7 there going to be cutoff points? I need an answer
- 8 to that question.
- 9 Is there going to be some kind of a
- 10 standard? Is 2 percent going to be okay? Is 13
- 11 percent going to be okay? How are we going to do
- 12 this?
- MR. WIEDMAN: I think that we've reached
- 14 a point here, Michael, that you may need to talk
- 15 to him directly.
- 16 UNIDENTIFIED WORKSHOP PARTICIPANT: I
- 17 want people to hear this crapola. I can talk to
- 18 him forever. I've seen him ten times in the last
- 19 four years.
- 20 MR. WIEDMAN: The purpose of Session 4 is
- 21 to give statements or --
- 22 UNIDENTIFIED WORKSHOP PARTICIPANT: I
- 23 just asked it, didn't I? Again, at any rate --
- MR. WIEDMAN: He's answered it to that
- 25 degree.

1 UNIDENTIFIED WORKSHOP PARTICIPANT: It's

- 2 not going to get done, and you know it. You owe
- 3 me an answer to that question.
- 4 MR. WIEDMAN: I want to make sure
- 5 everybody else has a opportunity to ask for
- 6 requests of information or clarification before we
- 7 move into Session 4, which is coming up, and you
- 8 can make a statement for the record, if you want.
- 9 Anybody else have a request for a
- 10 factual --
- 11 UNIDENTIFIED WORKSHOP PARTICIPANT: Did
- 12 you say at this point you don't have any
- 13 estimations as to how increased traffic will
- 14 affect emissions coming from the barges
- 15 themselves?
- 16 CORPS PERSONNEL: We're actually working
- 17 on that. I don't have the numbers right now
- 18 today, but it is a part of the study we're doing.
- 19 That same handout that I talked about,
- 20 the kind of traffic increase on the waterways,
- 21 there are also estimates on how and where railroad
- 22 traffic will increase on the system. And so we'll
- 23 be looking at use and emissions for each of these
- 24 alternatives both on the waterway as well as on
- 25 trucks and trains.

We're going to be concerned there with,

- 2 well, in either one of these scenarios certain
- 3 corridors basically cause the air quality to
- 4 exceed some EPA standards that are set, because a
- 5 lot of communities, especially waterways and I'm
- 6 sure along some of the railroads, are wrestling
- 7 really hard with quality standards.
- 8 That is an important part of the
- 9 equation. We don't have that information today.
- 10 UNIDENTIFIED WORKSHOP PARTICIPANT: As
- 11 far as the impact of any residual spills from
- 12 diesel fuels or whatnot in the water from
- 13 increased traffic, is there anything like that?
- 14 CORPS PERSONNEL: Paul can maybe talk to
- 15 this a little bit, but we have looked at whatever
- 16 records are out there on accidents and spills.
- 17 There's not a huge amount of historic data on
- 18 that.
- 19 We're doing our best to take that and
- 20 look at if there is a correlation between traffic
- 21 and accidents and spills and also prepare the
- 22 historic data and present that to DIS, what we
- 23 know about accident spills in the past.
- 24 UNIDENTIFIED WORKSHOP PARTICIPANT: Do
- 25 you know if the traffic is increased generally

- 1 will the traffic in diesel fuels on the river,
- 2 will that be increased also, or is it going to be
- 3 primarily grains and things like that?
- 4 CORPS PERSONNEL: Oh, I see. In terms of
- 5 the commodity portions?
- 6 UNIDENTIFIED WORKSHOP PARTICIPANT: Yeah.
- 7 CORPS PERSONNEL: Petroleum products and
- 8 the likes.
- 9 CORPS PERSONNEL: There's some increase
- 10 in all of the commodity groups moving on the
- 11 system. Grain, obviously, is the primary group on
- 12 the system and represents about 60 percent of the
- 13 total currently, but there are projected increases
- 14 for the petroleum products as well.
- 15 UNIDENTIFIED WORKSHOP PARTICIPANT: Do
- 16 you know at all what those increases might be?
- 17 CORPS PERSONNEL: Yes, but I can look it
- 18 up in just a second here.
- 19 UNIDENTIFIED WORKSHOP PARTICIPANT:
- 20 Okay. Thanks.
- 21 UNIDENTIFIED WORKSHOP PARTICIPANT: I
- 22 have a quick question about the study that was
- 23 done on the slide that we saw, the six species of
- 24 fish.
- 25 It was brought up in our session that

- 1 those studies were done only on four 15-minute
- 2 trollings behind barges; is that correct? How
- 3 large were those single populations, and is that
- 4 really a large enough sample population?
- 5 CORPS PERSONNEL: Actually, that trolling
- 6 number that people have brought up, what we
- 7 attempted to do -- it has never been done
- 8 before -- but we tried to come up with a way big
- 9 enough for a boat out there where we can drive a
- 10 big net at the back of the barge as we went down
- 11 the waterway to see how many adult fish were
- 12 killed by a passing barge. We were out in the
- 13 field for a little over 12 months, I guess, with
- 14 that study.
- We were able to get the gears working and
- 16 some trolling done. In the end we were only able
- 17 to do 53 events immediately in the back of
- 18 barges. Of the 53 events immediately in back of
- 19 barges, out of 53 events the nets were empty
- 20 immediately on the barges except for one time, and
- 21 that one time we got three gizzard shad.
- 22 So our challenge -- And that's where
- 23 those four samples or the four fish come in; three
- 24 gizzard shad, I guess it was. Our challenge is
- 25 when you have 50 samples where you have no dead

1 fish and then you have one sample where there's

- 2 three dead fish, how the heck do you project that
- 3 to the other 2,000 movements on the system?
- 4 So we realize we have a very small sample
- 5 size here. We do know that a lot of species of
- 6 fish exhibit moving out of the way. They move out
- 7 of the way of the barge as it comes and, I think,
- 8 avoid getting chopped up as adults.
- 9 We also know that at least three gizzard
- 10 shad didn't make that trip. We also know that as
- 11 the water gets colder in the fall, the fishes'
- 12 metabolism slows down, and maybe they are more
- 13 susceptible to entrainment.
- 14 So we really do think here we have a
- 15 sense that adult fish are not going to be
- 16 significantly impacted, but I think we're also
- 17 going to identify the need for some additional
- 18 sampling as a follow-along to that, because we do
- 19 only have these 50 samples.
- Now, all the other numbers on fish we
- 21 saw, the 2 percent and all that, we're much more
- 22 concerned with the larval fish, because they can't
- 23 swim out of the way of the big barges. So
- 24 basically what we did there is we scoured all the
- 25 literature; we got larval fish densities from

1 hydropower studies done in Pool 4 and Pool 8 and

- 2 down around the Quad Cities. Any data we could
- 3 find on larval fish densities in the main channel
- 4 and on portions of the Mississippi, we pulled that
- 5 altogether.
- 6 In addition to that, we put a crew out
- 7 for two years. They sampled in the pool portion
- 8 of Pool 26 down by St. Louis, and then in the open
- 9 portion of the river by Pool 26 by Alton and then
- 10 also went on the Illinois River near Alton.
- 11 And we went out from, I think it was,
- 12 April through August. We did larval fish sampling
- 13 there every week basically April through August so
- 14 we could see -- and we have some fancy slides that
- 15 weren't in Gary's presentation -- basically when
- 16 the freshwater drum are going to be out of the
- 17 system; when their larval fish are there; when the
- 18 walleye are there; when the carp are there; when
- 19 the catfish are there.
- 20 So we have density information that we
- 21 use, and then that's the thing we run through and
- 22 say, "If you have this one --" "If you have three
- 23 of this species of larval fish per cubic meter,
- 24 and you have an increase of four boats a day, how
- 25 many of those are going to be killed?"

1 So that's where we basically said, "With

- 2 this doubling in traffic, you'd see a 2 percent
- 3 reduction in number of larval fish." That's a
- 4 general statement. We have this information for
- 5 each species for each pool.
- 6 Then we said, "Well, so what? How much
- 7 of those would have lived to be adults anyway?"
- 8 And that's some of other numbers we have now, and
- 9 to get to Mike's question: Is that significant?
- 10 Again, the only way -- Since we don't have
- 11 standing stock data on the Mississippi River, we
- 12 don't have a real good handle on what the
- 13 population of fish are on the Mississippi River.
- 14 For some small lakes that's a job the
- 15 fisheries' biologists have been able to do. Even
- 16 on the Great Lakes they did that to some extent.
- 17 On the Mississippi River, even though the
- 18 Fish and Wildlife Service and the State have been
- 19 sampling in some cases for 40, 50 years, we really
- 20 still don't have a good standing stock. We don't
- 21 know how many catfish are out there and what the
- 22 carrying capacity is for catfish.
- 23 So to get to the issue of significance,
- 24 it's hard to directly go to a population study
- 25 and say, "A loss of 50 equivalent adults or larval

1 fish that aren't going to grow up into adults is

- 2 significant." What we're attempting to do is say,
- 3 "Well, how does that compare to what a bass
- 4 tournament might take out in a weekend, which
- 5 seems to be acceptable to society? How does that
- 6 compare to what commercial fishermen might take
- 7 out of this pool in a year? How does that compare
- 8 to what the hydropower industry is killing
- 9 elsewhere?"
- 10 We're trying to make those comparisons
- 11 and coordinate --
- 12 UNIDENTIFIED WORKSHOP PARTICIPANT: How
- 13 can you do that with only four samples?
- 14 CORPS PERSONNEL: We had 50 samples for
- 15 adult fish. The other is based on all the
- 16 existing literature as well as two years' worth of
- 17 sampling for larval fish.
- 18 So we have numerous samples on the larval
- 19 fish. It's not four samples. It was a long
- 20 story.
- 21 UNIDENTIFIED WORKSHOP PARTICIPANT: But
- 22 you never did find out how many larval fish were
- 23 actually killed? That's all mathematical
- 24 computation?
- 25 CORPS PERSONNEL: Yeah, unlike the adult

1 fish. We could actually see them. They were cut

- 2 up and caught in the net.
- 3 Those guys are so small there's no method
- 4 out there for us actually to get them out of the
- 5 river until they were killed. So we would have to
- 6 come up with a modeling way to approach that.
- 7 UNIDENTIFIED WORKSHOP PARTICIPANT: So
- 8 it's your best guess?
- 9 CORPS PERSONNEL: It's best guess. It's
- 10 the best state-of-the-art methodology we have.
- 11 UNIDENTIFIED WORKSHOP PARTICIPANT: Just
- 12 one very quick question here. Why couldn't we
- 13 diversify? We've got this big surplus of corn.
- 14 Why can't we diversify?
- Take a little leap here. Think about
- 16 hemp. A farmer could really get added value
- 17 immediately with hemp; added value immediately.
- 18 He can run his own farm. All the farms could be
- 19 run nontoxic with diesel oil made -- diesel fuels
- 20 made from hemp.
- Just a little leap here. I know it's a
- 22 really hostile subject here, but why do we have to
- 23 have just a big surplus of corn, megaproduction
- 24 out of less and less land, wrecking the land, more
- 25 and more encroachment going on, erosion, and

1 everything? There's no -- You don't need any

- 2 inputs.
- I know this is a question you can't
- 4 address, because it really goes to the heart of
- 5 what the U.S. stands for.
- 6 MR. WIEDMAN: Okay. I'll take that as a
- 7 statement.
- 8 UNIDENTIFIED WORKSHOP PARTICIPANT:
- 9 They'll do anything for war. They did it during
- 10 WW II. They made them grow more hemp for hemp for
- 11 victory.
- 12 Why not look upon this as a war? Huh?
- 13 Let's declare war on these environmental
- 14 terrorists. Let's do it. I declare it. I
- 15 declare war. Let's all of us declare war. Let's
- 16 have a war.
- MR. WIEDMAN: Darcy, we've, obviously,
- 18 moved into the statement period.
- 19 Let me get a handle on how many of you
- 20 out there want to make a statement or read a
- 21 position pair or get some idea of time. Okay.
- 22 Take five minutes. I'll call one minute to go.
- 23 Again, there is no sign up. Come up and
- 24 use that center mike. I think I'm going to move
- 25 this one down the side aisle a bit.

1 It's helpful if you identify yourself

- 2 and/or your group. You don't have to. If you're
- 3 just speaking for yourself, that's fine too. It
- 4 just makes it easier for the recorder if you
- 5 identify yourself.
- 6 (Brief recess.)
- 7 MR. WIEDMAN: Again, if you have a
- 8 statement, if you have prepared material and are
- 9 just summarizing it in your five minutes, please
- 10 make sure you leave it with the Corps. Drop it at
- 11 the reception desk area.
- Okay. Who's got a statement?
- 13 MR. REED: My name is Peter Reed. I live
- 14 in West Des Moines, Iowa, and I manage a joint
- 15 venture half-owned by Iowa farmers through a
- 16 cooperative, Agra Industries, and Cargill
- 17 Incorporated.
- 18 The Upper Mississippi River is a great
- 19 resource. The foresight of those with vision who
- 20 conceived the project has been rewarded with a
- 21 commercial transportation system where three modes
- 22 compete to move goods to and from the upper
- 23 Midwest.
- 24 The resulting prosperity of our
- 25 agricultural heartland is the envy of farmers,

- 1 consumers, and governments throughout the world.
- 2 It is imperative that we protect America's great
- 3 agricultural resource; fertile land normally
- 4 blessed with adequate rainfall and a temperament
- 5 climate tilled by well-educated farmers that are
- 6 becoming more environmentally friendly with
- 7 additional education.
- 8 There is no choice but to protect this
- 9 resource, and we must maintain an environmentally
- 10 sound, economically viable river system for our
- 11 nation.
- MR. WIEDMAN: Thank you, Peter. Next.
- 13 UNIDENTIFIED WORKSHOP PARTICIPANT: I
- 14 work with an environmental group in Des Moines
- 15 called Earth Care. I'm not sure I'm actually
- 16 representing them, but I think they'll give me
- 17 some support.
- 18 I'm just going to make a few comments
- 19 because of my observations of the question-and-
- 20 answer time. It was like there wasn't any way to
- 21 penetrate the people from the Corps of Engineers.
- 22 We have a lot of questions.
- 23 We feel like the project was undertaken
- 24 with the concept that it was going to be built,
- 25 whether it was Alternative B, C, D, E, F, or G;

1 that whatever we said was just our way of trying

- 2 to find some way to ask the questions that really
- 3 need to be asked.
- I would like to ask: Did you have these
- 5 kinds of hearings when you dechanneled the
- 6 Missouri River? And if you did, what were the
- 7 answers?
- 8 I believe we're the people, the
- 9 environmental people, and we're all environmental
- 10 people. I hear everybody saying they're in favor
- 11 of the environment, whether you're with the Corps
- 12 or anyone else.
- 13 The man who just spoke, he wants to have
- 14 environmental integrity; he wants vision. We need
- 15 vision. We need to be looking more than 20 or 30
- 16 years beyond. What will the crops be? What will
- 17 the condition be?
- 18 We went ahead and we built the whole
- 19 Saylorville Dam area. When we built it we knew it
- 20 was only going to be 30 years; that it was going
- 21 to be silted in. Did that stop us from building
- 22 it? I went to that hearing and asked some of
- 23 these same questions.
- I went to the hearing about improving
- 25 Interstate 235, and even the DOT, Department of

1 Transportation, said right in their statements

- 2 that the improvements were going to save five
- 3 minutes to get from downtown Des Moines to the
- 4 other suburbs in the west. Did that stop them
- 5 from building it? Did they have vision? Was it
- 6 the right thing to do for environmental
- 7 integrity? Thank you.
- 8 MR. WIEDMAN: Thank you.
- 9 MR. RUSSELL: I'm Matt Russell, born and
- 10 raised in Iowa. For a short time I lived out of
- 11 the state and deliberately moved back to the state
- 12 to be a part of Iowa.
- 13 What I say about Iowa could be said about
- 14 any of the states in the Upper Mississippi River
- 15 watershed. Some of them aren't just Iowa. You
- 16 could substitute Minnesota, Illinois, South
- 17 Dakota, Wisconsin.
- 18 Referencing one question that wasn't
- 19 really addressed, the question about the small
- 20 farms, the fact that the Corps didn't consider an
- 21 important aspect of the fact that the river plays
- 22 a complex and dynamic part of the whole watershed
- 23 and beyond, to miss that piece and not even
- 24 consider it, I think, says something about the
- 25 study.

1 Who benefits most from the expansion, and

- 2 who pays the cost? Taxpayer dollars and natural
- 3 public resources should not be used to subsidize
- 4 industries and corporations who have little
- 5 interest for public and national considerations.
- 6 In the near future and in the long-term future,
- 7 Iowa will continue to be a net exporter of food,
- 8 but in the current system subsidized by public
- 9 money and a willingness to sacrifice natural
- 10 resource, including soil, wildlife, safe drinking
- 11 water, Iowa is becoming a value subtracted state.
- 12 In the export economy Iowa is exporting
- 13 raw materials, commodities, and transnational
- 14 corporations are adding value that Iowa never
- 15 sees. In return, Iowa imports products in a way
- 16 that, again, takes financial assets out of the
- 17 state of Iowa.
- I find it indefensible that we would
- 19 choose to intensify this system of dependence that
- 20 keeps us from being the food capital of the world
- 21 and makes us more and more the raw materials for
- 22 food capital of the world, or in another way of
- 23 putting it, the company town of transnational
- 24 corporations.
- 25 Public dollars and public resources

1 should be invested in real alternatives using real

- 2 imaginations. Transnational corporations who have
- 3 little public interest and little national
- 4 interests should pay the real costs of doing
- 5 business, which, obviously, includes environmental
- 6 impact.
- 7 MR. WIEDMAN: Thank you. Next.
- 8 UNIDENTIFIED WORKSHOP PARTICIPANT: I'm
- 9 not an environmentalist, and I don't represent any
- 10 sort of special interests. I'm just a guy who
- 11 loves the river.
- 12 When I was 18 I couldn't wait to get away
- 13 from it, and I lived in Los Angeles for about
- 14 seven years. When I came back I realized what I
- 15 missed, and I just wanted to say that it seems to
- 16 me that when you look at the costs of not making
- 17 these changes to the waterway that you also have
- 18 to subtract what you talked about, the economist
- 19 talked about; the opportunity costs of not having
- 20 the changes made, but I think that you also have
- 21 to subtract the benefits realized from not having
- 22 the changes made.
- Those benefits, unfortunately, are not
- 24 necessarily tangible. They can't have a dollar
- 25 sign attached to them, but they are invaluable.

- 2 there like me who haven't come here this evening
- 3 but who feel the same way. One of their problems
- 4 is that their interests are very diverse. They
- 5 don't get together very often.
- 6 The special interest groups, they know
- 7 each other. They have a common goal, and that
- 8 goal is to realize profits, and that's a very
- 9 strong incentive.
- 10 My incentive being here tonight was just
- 11 to find out what's going on and finally to be able
- 12 to hopefully play some role in stopping the decay
- 13 of what is just a wonderful natural resource
- 14 throughout my entire life, and I just want to
- 15 continue to enjoy it; I want my kids to be able to
- 16 enjoy it the way I have.
- 17 It just seems to me that people seem
- 18 frustrated here tonight because they've said that
- 19 the Corps has already decided what it's going to
- 20 do, and I think they're right. I think this is a
- 21 formality.
- 22 I'm sorry, but I wonder if the Corps has
- 23 ever recommended to Congress that it not make any
- 24 additional changes or spend money on the
- 25 waterway. I just doubt that it has.

1 The objectivity of the people involved

- 2 here tonight has to be questioned, because in a
- 3 sense we're pointing to a fox being the guardian
- 4 of the hen house. You're going to receive your
- 5 paychecks, and the people in the Corps are going
- 6 to receive their paychecks by the projects that
- 7 the Corps is engaged in. I don't see how you can
- 8 overlook that.
- 9 I understand your frustrations. I'm sure
- 10 you try to be objective, but I think also you have
- 11 to realize that people are frustrated and they're
- 12 jaded, and I don't see how they cannot ask that
- 13 question here tonight. So I'm sure you're going
- 14 to get hit with that again. I hope you're patient
- 15 with it.
- In the end I think what I want to see
- 17 happen is I don't mind looking at the river and
- 18 seeing a barge go down the river. It's kind of
- 19 neat.
- I sat up on my brother's property
- 21 overlooking the river on Lock and Dam No. 9. I've
- 22 seen the barges come down the river. It's a neat
- 23 sight.
- 24 The river has a history of combining
- 25 utility and recreation. It's my opinion that

- 1 utility has been pressed to its limit at this
- 2 point. You can't eat a fish out of the river
- 3 without worrying about whether it's going to give
- 4 you cancer. I think that's just a little
- 5 ridiculous. That's all.
- 6 MR. WIEDMAN: Thank you.
- 7 UNIDENTIFIED WORKSHOP PARTICIPANT: I'd
- 8 like to give some encouragement to this young
- 9 man. Congress did just tell a Corps of Engineers
- 10 project to stop. There are eight newspaper
- 11 articles recently on this because the Corps did
- 12 not take into account nutrient impact of the
- 13 project.
- 14 I worked for 28 years trying to save the
- 15 Chesapeake Bay before I moved here. It took 28
- 16 years before we finally got Congress to do
- 17 something and tell the Corps, "Stop. Do your
- 18 study completely over, and you can't do this,
- 19 this, or this because of the nutrient flux."
- 20 Hypoxia is a big issue for the Gulf of
- 21 Mexico. If Congress will stop the Corps on
- 22 projects that increase hypoxia in the Bay, sooner
- 23 or later they're going to do it to stop hypoxia in
- 24 the Gulf of Mexico too.
- 25 MR. STALL: Dean Stall. I farm for a

- 1 living.
- 2 I think it's great our forefathers had
- 3 the foresight to build the lock and dam system on
- 4 the Mississippi River, and I think it's up to our
- 5 generation now to improve it.
- 6 MR. WIEDMAN: Okay. Thank you.
- 7 MR. SAND: I'm Duane Sand. I'm a voter
- 8 and taxpayer from Norwalk, Iowa.
- 9 The water belongs to the people. The
- 10 river belongs to the people. The fish, wildlife,
- 11 and living creatures of the river belong to the
- 12 people.
- 13 The locks and dams of the Upper
- 14 Mississippi and Illinois Rivers are an ecological
- 15 disaster that must come to an end. Our public
- 16 investment in redesigning the river to meet the
- 17 needs of the barge industry is a foolish use of
- 18 tax dollars. The only policy that can end this
- 19 ecological disaster is to phase out the lock and
- 20 dam system as soon as possible.
- 21 It's time to tell the navigation industry
- 22 to redesign their equipment to work in a healthy
- 23 river without locks and dams. The public will no
- 24 longer modify the river to meet their needs.
- 25 Instead, they must redesign their equipment to

1 navigate undamed channels. If they're unwilling

- 2 to retool for the 21st Century, the public should
- 3 help expand the nation's rail systems to meet the
- 4 transportation needs.
- 5 I endorse the no-action alternative in
- 6 your current study. I also urge the Corps of
- 7 Engineers to begin planning for tentative removal
- 8 of the dams.
- 9 MR. WIEDMAN: Okay. Thank you.
- 10 MR. CLUMBY: Again, I'm Chad Clumby
- 11 (phonetic) with the Iowa Soybean Association,
- 12 public affairs director. The Iowa Soybean
- 13 Association represents 8300 farmers in Iowa, and
- 14 we have overwhelmingly endorsed Alternative H in
- 15 seeing what that can do for the soybean industry.
- I know we spoke earlier about the
- 17 production we're going to see here in Iowa. There
- 18 are value-added opportunities. Those value-added
- 19 opportunities probably will not make a dent in
- 20 what Iowa is able to produce.
- 21 Our farmers are using the best management
- 22 practices. We're doing everything we can do to
- 23 control the nutrient load into the Mississippi.
- I'm an eastern Iowa boy and lived not too
- 25 far from the Mississippi. I'm also a farm boy,

1 and I know what our future here is looking at.

- 2 There's no question the farms are getting
- 3 smaller, but they've been getting smaller since
- 4 we've were able to -- the advent of the multiple
- 5 plow. It's business, and looking at businesses
- 6 there's margins involved, and I know many farmers
- 7 on our border are facing bases that are one-third
- 8 of the cost of a bushel of corn.
- 9 Can you continue to produce like that? I
- 10 don't know. I don't believe so, but this is just
- 11 one way we can address our surplus concerns. This
- 12 is just one way we can address long-term growth.
- I was in a group this evening, and a
- 14 gentleman said, "What's \$1 billion compared to the
- 15 \$10 billion we're going to be shelling out year
- 16 after year now looking at a farmer relief
- 17 package?" We're going to be -- If the Corps is to
- 18 take this seriously and look at taking or
- 19 implementing Alternative H, we're going to be able
- 20 to address those long-term concerns. And I think
- 21 that's what's most important, what we're talking
- 22 about here; long-term viability of Iowa as an
- 23 agricultural state and also as an environmental
- 24 state.
- We're finding the ways. We're using

1 technology to control erosion. We're doing all

- 2 the stewardship practices that we're expected to
- 3 do as producers. So give us a chance to do what
- 4 we want to do, and give us a chance to move those
- 5 particular products. Thank you.
- 6 MR. WIEDMAN: Thank you, Chad. Next.
- 7 MS. MUNCH: I'm Lynn Munch, the vice
- 8 president of the often-mentioned MARC 2000. I'd
- 9 like to start out with introductory comments and
- 10 go on to some specific comments about the study
- 11 and last, but not least, make some environmental
- 12 comments.
- 13 Barge transportation affects the lives of
- 14 all citizens of the upper Midwest. It keeps rail
- 15 rates, rates on coal lower, reducing utility
- 16 bills; removes untold trucks off the nation's
- 17 highways; reduces net fuel consumption and air
- 18 emissions; and in some areas helps reduce gasoline
- 19 costs at the pump by as much as 10 cents per gallon.
- 20 The American farmers' competitive edge in
- 21 exporting grain has always hinged on efficient
- 22 transportation; not being a low-cost producer.
- 23 Our major competitors -- Argentina, Brazil, and
- 24 China -- have made major investments in their
- 25 transportation systems and are dramatically

1 reducing their costs for moving grain. We must

- 2 modernize ours in order to maintain our strategic
- 3 advantage.
- 4 In that vein I'd like to also note that
- 5 several farmers who would like to be here tonight
- 6 are not attending because both the National Corn
- 7 Growers and the Soybean Growers have regional or
- 8 national meetings.
- 9 Currently barge companies pay 20 cents
- 10 per gallon fuel tax to fund waterway construction
- 11 improvements. To date the Upper Mississippi Basin
- 12 has contributed 40 percent of the revenue annually
- 13 into this fund but has received only 15 percent of
- 14 disbursements. It's time to put back into this
- 15 region the investments necessary to secure the
- 16 future of the waterway transportation system.
- 17 In its current configuration the proposal
- 18 that provides balancing the region, the greatest
- 19 increase in future capacity, and still offers a
- 20 justified investment is the one calling for five
- 21 1200-foot locks on the upper, two 1200-foots on
- 22 the Illinois River at LaGrange and Peoria, and
- 23 five guidewall extensions on the Upper
- 24 Mississippi. This is the alternative changes
- 25 currently supported by the MARC 2000 board.

1 The need for capacity during peak export

- 2 times must be addressed. Average delays mean
- 3 nothing when tows are waiting six days during the
- 4 peak export times. We simply can't get our
- 5 product to the export markets at good prices. It
- 6 is important to move rapidly with these
- 7 improvements, because it will take 12 to 15 years
- 8 to complete.
- 9 The U.S. faces the threat of losing an
- 10 even larger share of international grain and oil
- 11 seed market if we do not keep pace with the major
- 12 increases and transportation infrastructure
- 13 spending now taking place in Argentina and Brazil.
- 14 MARC 2000 would also request the Corps
- 15 evaluate the concept of new 1200-foot locks versus
- 16 lock extensions with a backdrop of current backlog
- 17 of deferred maintenance.
- 18 The Upper Mississippi region has over 300
- 19 million in deferred maintenance. There should be
- 20 considerable concern with extending existing locks
- 21 when we can't even perform necessary maintenance
- 22 on the 60- to 70-year-old structures.
- 23 Water transportation is the most
- 24 environmentally friendly means of moving bulk
- 25 commodities long distance. One barge carries the

1 same as 15 rail cars or 59 semi trucks; thus, the

- 2 movement of 100 million tons on the Upper
- 3 Mississippi by barge keeps 1 million rail cars or
- 4 4 million trucks away from our communities and
- 5 available for more appropriate short-term
- 6 movements.
- 7 Replacing the existing 600-foot locks
- 8 with new 1200-foot locks and even extending the
- 9 old ones will help the environment, not hurt by
- 10 transiting tolls faster, saving fuel, and
- 11 minimizing churning while waiting to lock
- 12 through.
- 13 Over the last few years considerable
- 14 efforts have been made to address environmental
- 15 concerns with the river through the summit
- 16 process. These efforts are ongoing and include
- 17 water level management practices and minimizing
- 18 practices, dredging placement practices, and
- 19 watershed practices.
- 20 Corn farmers -- EPA concludes that 14
- 21 percent of the rivers are impaired by nutrients;
- 22 however, corn farmers have reduced the amount of
- 23 fertilizer they apply to their fields by 27
- 24 percent since the mid-1980s, and this continues to
- 25 decline. Scott Favor in The Mississippi Monitor

1 in July of 1999 stated, "Most of the problems

- 2 facing the Mississippi River are not caused by
- 3 barges."
- 4 The EMP program has constructed 24
- 5 projects protecting or restoring 28,000 acres of
- 6 habitat. With 12 more completed, a total of
- 7 60,000 acres of habitats will be enhanced.
- 8 MARC 2000 and our members would sincerely
- 9 like to thank the Corps of Engineers for holding
- 10 these meetings when it was not necessary or
- 11 required of them to do so.
- MR. WIEDMAN: Thank you.
- 13 MS. NOISTAT: My name is Debbie Noistat
- 14 (phonetic). I'm a teacher here in Des Moines, and
- 15 I also volunteer for the Sierra Club.
- 16 I grew up in St. Louis, and a couple
- 17 weekends ago I was back in St. Louis. And I
- 18 crossed over 270, and there's a barge canal in
- 19 St. Louis. And it looks nice and straight, and
- 20 it's on the Illinois side, and it's got rocks on
- 21 the side to prevent erosion, I guess.
- 22 And I want to do everything legally
- 23 possible to keep the Mississippi River from
- 24 looking like that, and that's what I think MARC
- 25 2000 wants. They want a straight, 9-foot channel,

1 whatever it takes to make those barges run. And

- 2 I'm going to do everything legally in my power to
- 3 prevent the river from turning into what I saw is
- 4 the ideal barge canal.
- 5 I'm a biologist by training, even though
- 6 I do pride myself on being a public school
- 7 teacher. The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and
- 8 UMRCC have both stated that you guys haven't
- 9 studied enough; you haven't done the scientific
- 10 studies needed to explain the costs that increased
- 11 traffic on the river is going to cause. So I'm
- 12 glad that these scientists have the guts to come
- 13 out and say that some of this stuff is flawed, and
- 14 that's what I think is meant by sound science.
- 15 The Sierra Club, Midwest Region has been
- 16 attending seven public workshops the U.S. Army
- 17 Corps of Engineers is conducting throughout the
- 18 Upper Mississippi River region since July 26th.
- 19 This series of workshops is intended to inform the
- 20 public regarding alternatives being examined as
- 21 part of the plan formulation process for
- 22 potentially expanding navigation capacity and
- 23 reducing delays on the Upper Mississippi and
- 24 Illinois Waterway System. We've previously
- 25 written to you regarding our concerns with the

1 rush to judgment we see occurring with this

- 2 process.
- 3 We have two additional observations
- 4 regarding the plan formulation process and the
- 5 public workshops. First, we've discovered, only
- 6 because we've attended several workshops
- 7 personally, that a period set aside for questions
- 8 to be forwarded to attending Corps personnel is
- 9 being manipulated, according to people who have
- 10 seen these hearings before.
- 11 After the introductory slide show,
- 12 attendees are broken into small groups for
- 13 discussions and to ask questions, and they believe
- 14 these questions -- those questions that cannot be
- 15 answered within small groups are to be written
- 16 down and submitted to the workshop leadership to
- 17 be answered when the groups recombine in the
- 18 auditorium, or so the attendees are told.
- 19 Actually, it's a set of prepared
- 20 questions. Is there a set of prepared questions
- 21 drawn up by the Corps personnel, and are those the
- 22 ones that are actually being answered? All our
- 23 written questions are set aside to be answered as
- 24 a part of the written record of the meeting unless
- 25 this individual happens to get up and have enough

1 guts like I do during a verbal question-and-answer

- 2 period and ask the question.
- 3 This is misleading to the public and is
- 4 generating serious concerns on the part of the
- 5 public regarding the trustworthiness of this kind
- 6 of process. Additionally, it raises the question
- 7 of when an individual may ever get their question
- 8 answered unless the Corps is planning on releasing
- 9 to all who attend the full record collected from
- 10 all the workshops with all the accompanying
- 11 questions answered.
- 12 Second, and quite obviously, throughout
- 13 the initial four meetings, there is a "rush to
- 14 judgment" we refer to our in our previous letter.
- 15 We point out that all parties to this issue are
- 16 misled by the failure of the workshops and the
- 17 publicly released preliminary national economic
- 18 development plans to include system environmental
- 19 costs.
- 20 We are supported in this by the
- 21 observations of numerous organizations including,
- 22 among others: Quasi-governmental bodies, such as
- 23 the Quad City Chamber of Commerce; nongovernmental
- 24 organizations, such as MARC 2000 and the Illinois
- 25 Corn Growers; and businesses, such as Alter Barge

1 Lines, are stepping forth and endorsing a

- 2 particular alternative.
- 3 This may have serious consequences for
- 4 the U.S. Corps of Engineers publicly and legally
- 5 as the process for selecting any alternative,
- 6 including without project, moves to the governors
- 7 liaison committee meetings in August and
- 8 November.
- 9 Proposal H, as presented at the
- 10 workshops, which includes 1200-foot locks at Lock
- 11 and Dams 20-25 plus Peoria and LaGrange on the
- 12 Illinois and guidewall extensions at Locks 14 to
- 13 18 presented with a cost/benefit ratio of 1.04
- 14 to 1 is drawing the most attention. It is also
- 15 among the most vulnerable to dropping with system
- 16 environmental costs inputted. NED discussions
- 17 without system environmental costs are creating a
- 18 serious legitimacy problem for the process.
- 19 We're urging you to postpone the
- 20 governors liaison meeting scheduled for August 16th
- 21 and 19th. Postpone the planned December 1999 date
- 22 for the forwarding of an initial recommended plan,
- 23 build in new public workshops upon completion of
- 24 the system environmental costs, and establish new
- 25 realistic dates for an IRP for sometime in the

1 second quarter or third quarter of 2000, after

- 2 full public discussion of alternatives with full
- 3 disclosure of costs and benefits.
- 4 That's the statement of the Sierra Club.
- 5 MR. WIEDMAN: Thank you. And I'm
- 6 assuming you're going to provide copies. Again, I
- 7 ask all of you that have prepared statements, make
- 8 sure the Corps gets a copy of that.
- 9 UNIDENTIFIED WORKSHOP PARTICIPANT: I too
- 10 am from St. Louis and know the Noistats and all
- 11 sorts of farmers on the Missouri as well as the
- 12 Mississippi.
- What bothers me here is to listen to Lynn
- 14 do the old North-South debate in terms of the
- 15 Upper Mississippi River and the rivers in South
- 16 America. Who owns the barges? Follow the money.
- 17 Those people would not be down there, would not be
- 18 funding it down there unless it was a tremendous
- 19 financial opportunity that would be borne on our
- 20 back, as all of this is. Thank you.
- MR. WIEDMAN: Thank you.
- 22 Additional statements, comments, issue
- 23 papers?
- MR. BRIGHTBACH: My name is Michael
- 25 Brightbach (phonetic), and I'm a long-standing

1 member of Mississippi River Revival. I'm

- 2 representing myself tonight.
- 3 I want to thank you guys for doing the
- 4 job you're doing. I understand the kind of
- 5 pressure that's put on you to not take a position
- 6 yourself. It's hard to say what your actual
- 7 sentiments are.
- 8 Hold on to your shorts, because when you
- 9 go to Wisconsin tomorrow night, you're going to
- 10 find an even rougher crowd. And if you do live
- 11 through that and make it up to Minnesota, I do
- 12 believe that a couple of you are going to be asked
- 13 to tag team wrestle with Mike Davis and the
- 14 governor of Minnesota.
- I know that you're asked to do a very
- 16 succinct study on traffic on the river, and I know
- 17 that Congress has asked you to do this. It's
- 18 pretty hard to follow the chain of command here
- 19 sometimes. You can't point at anyone and say,
- 20 "This is what we'd like to do," or, "Why aren't
- 21 you doing this?" And you guys are saying, "Well,
- 22 we're only authorized to do this much."
- 23 It's not simply a matter of: How fast
- 24 can we move this down the river? There are some
- 25 real complex cultural questions going on here.

1 This is not just about making money.

- 2 This is about this country being a leader in the
- 3 world. A leader of what? A leader of: How do we
- 4 do the right thing? We don't stand back in
- 5 Bosnia. We sit there and argue about it. Are we
- 6 going to get involved in Bosnia, or are we not
- 7 going to get involved in Bosnia? Are we going to
- 8 side with guerrillas in Nicaragua, or are we going
- 9 to help the establishment in Nicaragua?
- 10 This is a complex question. What's in
- 11 that barge going down that river? It has huge
- 12 ramifications.
- 13 As I said, in earlier questions, they
- 14 were asked in earlier questions: What is going to
- 15 happen to this stuff? Is it going to make a
- 16 better world? Are we making more and more high-
- 17 fructose corn syrup from corn so we can make
- 18 people happier and give them diabetes? Are we
- 19 actually feeding poor people, or are we feeding
- 20 grain to animals so it can get turned into meat
- 21 for a burgeoning middle class in China and other
- 22 third world countries where they now have free
- 23 enterprise not to be confused with capitalism?
- It is my hope that you are going to go
- 25 back, and some day I'm actually going to see

- 1 this -- I've been asking for years. This study
- 2 has at least to be widened to include the farmland
- 3 in which this grain is being produced.
- 4 You want to talk ecosystem? Let's talk
- 5 about all of it and stop tagging people as
- 6 environmentalists, because that's such a negative
- 7 thing. We are ecologists looking at an ecosystem,
- 8 and you can't call the river from bank to bank the
- 9 ecosystem. You have to look at the larger picture
- 10 here.
- 11 And I understand that it's not you as
- 12 individuals. I don't know who I'm addressing
- 13 here. Am I addressing the president of the Army
- 14 Corps of Engineers? Is this where this is going?
- 15 Am I addressing the President of United States
- 16 here? Who am I addressing? It gets a little
- 17 foggy, a little thick.
- 18 You know, in 1994 when the Corps came to
- 19 Dubuque, 300 people spoke against that, and three
- 20 people spoke for expansion of navigation. My
- 21 question was the same as the lady's earlier:
- 22 Where's the people that want this here? How come
- 23 the corporations aren't here?
- I do believe the gentleman before me
- 25 answered part of that question: Follow the

1 money. It's the same people down in South America

- 2 that own the barge lines down there that own the
- 3 barge lines up here. They just keep us busy
- 4 fighting each other trying to decide whether the
- 5 farmers are right or the environmentalists are
- 6 right. In the meantime they just keep making the
- 7 money.
- 8 You're going to have to rein the business
- 9 of science in here. I'm involved in my education
- 10 in social sciences, and that was perhaps even more
- 11 difficult to quantify, to try to use statistics.
- 12 You can't just go out and do these
- 13 ecological studies without having some way of
- 14 determining what they mean, and you can't wait
- 15 until after you've gathered it to determine it.
- 16 You've got to set some goals ahead of time. There
- 17 is a clear lack of this.
- 18 I know it's not the federal government's
- 19 business in a free enterprise system to get
- 20 involved with determining for people what they can
- 21 buy or sell, but we do get involved with the issue
- 22 of poison; and we do get involved with the issue
- 23 of fairness, and we have to support the people who
- 24 are the backbone of this country: The people that
- 25 are working the land.

1 They come first. They're the ones that

- 2 feed us, and they need an opportunity to grow some
- 3 crops where they don't have to bust their buns to
- 4 wonder if they're going to make it. We have to
- 5 give them alternatives and not set them against us
- 6 because we don't want dirty water.
- 7 MR. WIEDMAN: Thank you, Michael.
- 8 MR. RICHARDS: I'm Jim Richards, member
- 9 of the board of directors, Iowa Corn Growers
- 10 Association.
- 11 There have been many eloquent speeches --
- 12 I hate to use the word -- on both sides, but
- 13 different points of views tonight, and I
- 14 appreciate the fact we've all come together to
- 15 study this problem.
- 16 We, as Iowa corn growers, support the
- 17 expansion of the lock system. We're firmly
- 18 transferred to the MARC 2000, and we feel like
- 19 there's enough room for the resource to handle the
- 20 increased river traffic. Heaven knows we're going
- 21 to have to increase the commodity to put down the
- 22 river as well as what was suggested in the
- 23 value-added portion. Some of that may very well
- 24 go by river too.
- 25 I'll keep my comments very brief, but we

1 do support expansion of the system. Thank you. 2 MR. WIEDMAN: Thank you, Jim. Other comments; statements? Well, seeing 4 nobody jumping up and running to the mike, I guess 5 I'll draw the evening to a close and encourage you 6 to turn in your comment sheets. Please take 7 advantage of the research papers. 8 Thank you for being a part of this. I 9 know it's added to a long day, but we appreciate 10 your involvement. Thank you. 11 (Workshop concluded at 10:12 p.m.) 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23

> SUSAN FRYE AND ASSOCIATES, INC. 400 Locust - 170 Capital Square Des Moines, IA 50309-2331 515-284-1972

24

25

Τ	CERTIFICATE
2	I, the undersigned, a Certified Shorthand
3	Reporter of the State of Iowa, do hereby certify
4	that I acted as the official court reporter at the
5	public workshop in the above-entitled matter at
6	the time and place indicated.
7	That I took in shorthand all of the
8	proceedings had at the said time and place and
9	that said shorthand notes were reduced to
10	typewriting under my direction and supervision,
11	and that the foregoing typewritten pages are a
12	full and complete transcript of the shorthand
13	notes so taken.
14	Dated at Des Moines, Iowa, this 12th day
15	of August, 1999.
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	CERTIFIED SHORTHAND REPORTER
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	